

Appln No. 10/603,460
Amdt date March 31, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 1, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 - 22, 24 - 26, and 28 were pending when the Application was last examined. Claim 23 had been withdrawn and claim 27 had been canceled. Claims 1 - 26 and 28 are being canceled and new Claims 29 - 47 are being added by this amendment of which Claims 29 and 35 are independent. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to claim 28 for informalities and rejected claims 25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The Examiner also made the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 for obviousness: claims 1 - 4, 15 - 18, and 26 over Hutzell (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0117728) in view of Chan (US Patent No. 5,899,956) and further in view of the Background of the Invention section of the Application; claims 5 - 10, 13, and 19 - 22 over Hutzell in view of Chan and further in view of Turnbull (US Patent No. 6,750,823); claims 11, 12, and 14 over Hutzell in view of Chan and further in view of McCarthy (US Patent No. 6,678,614); claims 24 and 25 over Hutzell in view of Chan and the Background of the Invention section of the Application and further in view of Scharton (US Patent No. 5,262,813); and claim 28 over Rayner (US Patent No. 6,405,112) in view of Schofield (US Patent No. 5,798,688) and further in view of Turnbull.

New Claim 29 calls for "A method for compiling operational activity data of a vehicle, comprising ... upon the processor determining that the sensor system has detected a triggering event, the processor controlling data transfer from the dynamic ram memory to the solid state persistent storage device of data detected during a predetermined time spanning before and after the triggering event." (Emphasis added). This element is supported throughout the specification and drawings, for example, on page 26 lines 20-21 and on page 27, lines 13-15 of the specification. Among the various references cited by the Examiner, according to page 17, first paragraph, of the Office Action, Rayner discloses detecting significant events and transferring last few seconds of video/voice/motion from DRAM to Flash. Rayner states that "if CPU 74 determines that the acceleration data exceed a predetermined threshold value indicative of a collision or other event that would warrant investigation, CPU 74 copies data from buffer

Appln No. 10/603,460
Amdt date March 31, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 1, 2005

memory 78 to persistent memory 100." (Rayner, col. 6, lines 19-23). These statements are directed to a data dump of data collected up to a certain trigger event, such as an accident, to a permanent memory. However, Applicant submits that Rayner does not disclose "data transfer from the dynamic ram memory to the solid state persistent storage device of data detected during a predetermined time spanning before and after the triggering event" of new Claim 29.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 29 is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner whether taken alone or in combination.

Claims 30 - 34 depend from Claim 29 and are believed allowable based on Claim 29.

New Claim 35 calls for "A vehicle safety communication device ... wherein the solid state persistent storage device stores compressed sound and visual data and motion data occurring within a time interval centered about a time of generation of the trigger signal." (Emphasis added). As explained above, Rayner that was cited for disclosing a data transfer, does not disclose a "time interval centered about ... the trigger signal" of new Claim 35 and rather refers to a transfer of data up to the point of the trigger event which may be due to an assumption of Rayner that after the trigger event, for example an accident, data collection may be disrupted.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 35 is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner whether taken alone or in combination.

Claims 36 - 47 depend from Claim 35 and are believed allowable based on Claim 35.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the pending Claims 29 - 47 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By Fariba Sirjani
Fariba Sirjani
Reg. No. 47,947
626/795-9900